

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/603,510	06/26/2000	Arthur Dale Burns	STUD-0001	2809
7	590 11/05/2002			
Jimmy L Heisz Hitt Chwang & Gaines PC P O Box 832570 Picker Try 25002			EXAMINER	
			BASHORE, ALAIN L	
Richardson, TX 75083		ſ	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	3624
			DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/603,510	BURNS, ARTHUR DALE $\mathcal T$			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alain L. Bashore	3624			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SH THE - Exte afte: - If th - If NO - Faill - Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed D) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 A	<u>lugust 2002</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
· · <u> </u>	cion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application					
5.\□	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
· <u> </u>)					
	_					
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept	ted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
	13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 					
* (application from the International Bui See the attached detailed Office action for a list	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	· ·			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachmer						
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Infor	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152) .			
C D-1117	Irademark Office					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tengel et al in view of (Levine et al and Mottola et al).

Tengel et al discloses a loan qualification system and internet site. An input module, associated with an Internet site, that presents at least one page to a loan applicant to assist said loan applicant in providing personal and loan information pertaining to a plurality of loans made to said loan applicant (fig. 5; col 8, lines 50-60).

A qualification module, associated with said input module, that assesses said personal information to determine a personal qualification of said loan applicant and assesses said loan information pertaining to said plurality of debts to determine a loan qualification of said loan applicant (figs 3a-3b; col 5, lines 29-67; col 6, lines 1-61)

Application/Control Number: 09/603,510

Art Unit: 3624

The qualification module qualifying said loan applicant and informing said loan

applicant and a lender only if said personal qualification and said loan qualification are

positive (fig 6).

Tengel discloses loan guarantor information included in the personal information

and aggregate loan debt of said loan applicant to determine said loan qualification (fig 5,

"joint applicant").

The qualification module qualifies said loan applicant if an aggregate loan debt

of said loan applicant exceeds a predetermined amount (col 5, lines 55-62).

Since Tengel discloses requiring information concerning all of applicant's debts,

this inherently includes whether the plurality of loans are from more than one lender to

determine said loan qualification.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a

secured site to Tengel et al for the purposes of security of personal information.

Tengel et al does not disclose:

loan consolidation;

student loans as the loan;

the site is associated with an affinity group; and

student loans guaranteed by a government-sponsored program.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/603,510

Art Unit: 3624

Levine et al discloses loan consolidation (col 1, lines 49-67;col 2, lines 1-12) and

Page 4

student loans as loans (col col 7, lines 37).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include student

loans as the loans to Tengel et al because Tengel et al teaches his invention may

include personal loans (col 5, lines 24-25) and Levine et al teaches student loans as

one type of loan (col 7, lines 30-46).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include loan

consolidation to Tengel et al because Levine et al teaches finacial advantages to loan

consolidation (col 2, lines 1-5).

Mottola et al discloses affinity groups (col 6, lines 7-18) and government-

sponsored programs to guarantee student loans (col 1, lines 22-25).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a site

associated with an affinity group to Tengel et al because Mottola et teaches such for

investment purposes (col 5, lines 61-62).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include to

Tengel et al the determination of the plurality of loans are guaranteed by government-

Application/Control Number: 09/603,510 Page 5

Art Unit: 3624

sponsored programs because Mottola et al teaches that loan programs are known (col 1, line 19).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/603,510

Art Unit: 3624

Page 6

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 703-308-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Alternate Fridays Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-1113.

Alain L. Bashore

October 31, 2002

VINCENT MILLIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600